

Western BCA Pool Players Association
Regular Meeting – November 3rd, 2024

Opening: Quorum was established and President Tammy Culbertson called the meeting to order at 12:11 pm via Zoom

Members Present via Zoom:

Shawn Self, Becky Potter, Stacy Stillwell, Arlyn Groshong, Johnnie Landis, Tammy Culbertson, Vic Albertson, Sue Leger, Raquel Minjarez, Suzanne Mackey, Rick Cates, Tracii Self, Michelle Jensen, Amber Davis, Bee Evans, Shelly Huntoon, Calvin Gilliland, Camatha Groshong, Deepak Hemnani, Tyler Spires, Elaine Eberly, Robin Adams, Nikki Bisconer, Rob Cameron, Dave Chavez, Trina Chavez, Brittany DeWalt, Julie Fraser, Tim Fraser, Jackson McDonald, Cindy Medina, Patty Mitchell, Shirley Morgan, Mike Rick, Eunie Sleight, Darin Walding, Matt Andrews, Teren Bryson, Lawrence Frampton, Nancy Measor, Ed Slade, Joe Towne, Leonard Blaine, Michael Choe, Mika Culy, Jeff Beers, Stephanie Crystal, Terra Frei, Tami Conibear, Harvey Stanley, Alex Vogel, Angela Busenbark, Sam Rabito, Robert Gering, Carlie Watrous, Aaron Sullivan, Michael Deitchman, Katie Hamersky, Chris Nordling

Agenda: Agenda was approved as presented with one abstention

Meeting Minutes: Minutes from 8-4-24 draft 1 were approved with one abstention

President's Statement: Tammy Culbertson Timestamp: 13:06

You know, I think that the tournament went very well this last time for nine ball.

I think that it went very well. As the first time, first event as president, I kept waiting for the big catastrophe to hit and thankful it never did. For the most part, I think we had a pretty good group of people that, there was a couple issues, which we'll get to that later but overall, everything ran pretty smooth and I didn't get much feedback on anything of any issues so I will go ahead and pass it on to Suzanne Mackey, VP, if she would like to add anything.

Vice President's Statement: Suzanne Mackey Timestamp: 14:15

I got a chance to walk around and listen to a lot of people. Kind of fly under the radar a little bit. Did not really hear any major negatives. Of course, you always have a few that have their own personal agendas. But you just kind of listen. And Tammy, I believe, well, specifically you and Sue, I think you guys did a fabulous job of just keeping things moving and keeping everyone informed of what was going on. I think Elaine did a great job up at the podium, as usual, and everybody seemed to be extremely prepared. Dave Chavez, you did, you were diligent in having your meeting with all of the refs and your own people. And it was really great to see people walking, official people from Western BCA walking through the crowd on a regular basis. It really made a huge difference in, I think, how people for the most part, acted. And kudos to everyone that did a great job. So I think everything went quite smoothly. And everybody, you know, the board, everyone was involved in their own, you know their own matters wherever they could, wherever they could help out. And I think that was great too. So I think it was a good event. Thank you.

Tammy: Thank you, Suzanne. And yes, I agree and also thank everyone from Pat Mitchell, Tournament Registrar, Sue and Pat worked together great. This was Pat's first time as tournament registrar so she did a good job, great job. And all the board, everybody, I think that we all, the leadership, we all kind of worked pretty good together

Secretary Statement: Julie Fraser

No statement

Treasurer Report: Sue Leger Timestamp: 16:50

I sent out reports or I sent them to Julie and she sent out reports. I really don't have much of a report. I'm just working on paying people that did not get checks because they didn't know they were in the money. There's just a couple. That's all I've got. Oh, I'm getting ready for 1099s too here next month.
Discussion:

- Tami Conibear: The only question I had on the treasurer's report is, I see that our beginning balance and ending balance was a significant difference. Was that because of tournament expenses? Or added money. Just a clarification. I saw that we started with like 45,000 and we ended with 25,000.
- Sue: Yes, that would be added money, expenses, things like referees, our portion of food vouchers.
- Tami: So our expenses went up in comparison to past events?
- Sue: It would look like it, yes. There are also some other behind the scenes type events that we're not involved with the tournament per se. Websites, things we had to purchase
- Camatha: Is this where we ask questions on the report of payouts? I thought I saw, and I'm running on two computers, I thought the payouts for the nine ball tournament did not equal the payouts that I submitted. And so I'm just curious why they were so different.
- Sue: Well, we do have things in payouts like the added money. That's not a separate line in there. We have things in there like fun day money that came to me like cash and got paid back out like people didn't pick up their fun day payouts.
- Camatha: Okay, so it wasn't just the main tournament that included Fun Day and several other things.
- Sue: Yeah, some of the funding, just a small amount, a couple hundred.
- Tammy: It would also include some of the payouts would also include a second chance and fun day payouts.
- Sue: That's several thousand dollars. It's a pretty big chunk.

Board of Directors Report: Lawrence Frampton Timestamp: 19:30

Hi everybody, hopefully you had a chance to read the board report we sent out. I didn't include yesterday's meeting, obviously, because we had to get everything out by then. So there's that. I guess, are there any questions about, other than the Cascade Pool League situation, are there any other questions about the board report that I sent out?

Okay. And with that I would like to motion to have the board of director's actions regarding Cascade BCA Pool League voted on so that we can get those ratified like we did last time we did this. And I would also like to add that since we voted on it, Players Club Limited has now started a league out of the Golden Fleece. It has 40 players in it, they started on the 30th and I think they're adding actually a couple more to that league as well. I'm sorry, division. Sorry, PCL is running a division out of Golden Fleece now, which was part of the hang-up before when Cascade applied for sanctioning last time.

- Nikki: Hey, to clarify on that, Lawrence, so that means that us as members voted one way about that, and it ended up working out because isn't Ed working with them or something like that now? And it ends up being in line with what we all voted on. Is that correct?

It's Nancy Measor that's running it for Players Club Limited because at the time that Cascade applied last time, it was said that there was nothing out of Golden Fleece because it's technically PCL's area of operations. Membership voted it down by a large amount. But they reapplied. They wanted to run through Wenatchee, at the Golden Fleece in Wenatchee and also through Golden Fleece in Everett and have an area that was ran between Everett and Wenatchee based on what was put down on the application for sanctioning. The board of directors reviewed it. Six of us voted no and one abstained and we just need membership to ratify that vote so we can do whatever. And if that's totally up to membership and how they want to handle the situation.

Motion 2024-16 to ratify the Boards decision to deny the Cascade pool league's sanctioning request.

Approved: 52

Opposed: 1

Abstain: 6

HOF Committee: Tammy Culbertson spoke for Clay Belvoir Timestamp: 31:09

Tammy: I can just kind of give a little bit about the Hall of Fame Committee. I know Clay really put his heart and soul and worked on that a lot. There was a lot of times it a lot of time that he spent with helping to create the videos and contacts and all that kind of stuff. And I don't know if anybody knows, but Clay also, his father is in the hall of fame for racehorses. So I think that that's one reason why he is pretty passionate about the Hall of Fame for Western BCA as well. I think he did a wonderful job. I think that the ceremony went well. We did have a couple little issues that we had to overcome and HDMI cords weren't working. We had to you know to we had to kind of be creative with making sure that the video was up on the big screen so everybody could see and then everybody could hear it through the microphones because there were some issues with the microphones as well. But all in all, it we got through it and I think it went very well and I think he did a great job and everybody else that was on the committee, I think, also contributed to doing a great job with that. So I'll leave it at that unless anybody else has anything, anybody from the committee that wants to add anything to add. Darin? Who else is on there? Julie? Try to make who else is on there. Shirley Morgan, I think is on there. Does anybody else have anything they want to add as far as the Hall of Fame goes?

Darin: I just agree with what you just said. Clay worked really hard on the thing and a lot of hours went into it that people don't understand just to pull off the ceremony.

Tournament Committee: Jackson McDonald Timestamp: 33:42

If I could just combine the Tournament and competition, I'll go in order, that'd be good.

So I wanted to start off by saying good afternoon to everybody. Glad to see everybody come together on this fine Sunday afternoon to hang out together. Obviously, in an effort to continue to support and help grow our amazing membership. And I'd also like to thank all of you that attended our last tournament, really, you know, supporting that, made our last event, you know, really great. I think everybody had a great time so I personally believe it was the best event that we've had in a very long time. So thanks to everybody. And with that, we'll start with the Tournament Committee.

So our most recent meeting was Sunday, October 27th, went for two hours from 5 to 7 p.m. We discussed a lot during the meeting, first focusing on how the most recent nine ball tournament went and then moved on to discussing continuing improvements and moving forward. As you all know, this is a committee that always has a job to do in an effort to increase the player experience and really grow participation down at the coast. So the topics that we discussed, we talked about Fun day, how that was put together, how it was ran, so on and so forth. Talked about overall feedback that everybody may have heard during the tournament. Talked about possible changes to the tournament structure, potential scheduling changes and how the scheduling went for the overall tournament, we've talked about streaming and more so on that, you know, we continue to have these meetings uh starting now more on a regular basis hopefully once every month or so. And, you know, continue to look for feedback from any and all that would like to give it so we can really talk about that in our meetings and figure out, you know, if things are just perfect or if we need to work on things and do better next time. Anybody have any questions about the Tournament Committee?

Discussion: Timestamp: 36:11

Competition Committee: Jackson McDonald Timestamp: 1:02:51

So, moving on to the Competition Committee. The Competition Committee has met multiple times, especially as of late. They've been working very, very hard to review all the data from our past tournaments in an effort to confirm or suggest the scotch team and caps. I want to give a very special shout out to three individuals that really went the extra mile to help, you know, structure, review, and process all the data. Harvey Stanley, Carly Watrous, and Tammy Conibear. They did a freaking amazing job. They really did. I mean, they came together they were at every meeting. They were involved in every discussion. Had great, you know, back and forth via email. You know, Harvey put a great tool together to really process all this data, try different things, change caps, see what the results were, so on and so forth. I am very, very, very thankful for those three, they did an amazing job. I also want to give a shout out to Ric Jones with Bad Boys. With very short notice, he took about two and a half hours out of his late, very late evening on Thursday to really review and suggest and also approve of the effort that the committee put forth. You know, I appreciate that as somebody that, you know, doesn't have to do that. I mean, he's really trying to be a partner of ours and to help us out and you know, ask tough questions and really kind of confirm or not what we're putting together so, again, I appreciate that.

With that being said, I'd like to pull up our proposed caps for teams and scotch. I'd like to review them, do a little bit of explaining. Maybe answer a few questions. I really don't want this to be a huge, big debate or any of that stuff. Questions are great. And then at the end of each caps discussion, I'd like to throw them up to a vote for the eight ball caps and I'd like to make this change, if it's a change, I'd like to make this change for the following two years. You know, we really need to do things for extended periods of time to really see what the effect is. And, you know, changing things every tournament really, really doesn't help us any. It's really make a change, see what it does for two years. If it doesn't work, make another change, right? But throughout the next two years, we'll also be reviewing and processing the data from the tournaments that we play in to make sure or confirm whether it was a good change or not. All right, so I'm going to go ahead and share my screen on the first one, which will be Teams.

Okay, so I am going to go ahead and share my screen and then I will pull up the teams report. All right. So what we're looking at, though it doesn't look like much, was hours and hours and hours of data review. Harvey put in a really cool tool together to, you know, to really, again, test this and see what movement happened, you know, what movement changes when we make a change, so on and so forth. So this is the eight ball 2024 Team event stats. So it shows a number of teams, number of players, average player Fargo and overall average team Fargo and then it goes in and it shows our stats. So it shows player Fargo min and max in each division. All the way through and then team Fargo min and max for each division all the way through. And then it shows an average player cap or excuse me, yeah, an average player cap. And then it shows there's a difference between the cap and the average player itself. Harvey, jump in here if you think there's anything else to add. But really, it covers all that. So for the team event working through all of this together and with Ric Jones. We decided that the new proposed caps should change and this is what they would change to in the red. So we bumped up the minimum bronze or I'm trying not to use names but we bumped up the minimum or the lowest rated team from 1600 to 1650 and then we went with a certain point spread from there which is a 250 point spread across the board. What that did was really kind of average out a little bit the difference in the player rating, it bumps the average cap per player up to where it's a little more normalized with the same players you know with like speed players playing with each other to an extent, right? It doesn't fit perfectly but it gets it a lot closer than what it was before. And again, if you look at the field percentage of play it made a little bit of a change from, they made a 1% change at the highest level. Next level down, it made a 3% change. Next level down from that, it made a 2% change and the next level made a 1% change up so each time we reviewed these to kind of see, again, what the change would be within everything. And it really brings, the biggest thing is it brings the average player together more in each respective division. Right. So, and again, if you look here there's, you know, mins and maxes, you know all I think there's actually a little typo in

here with this one. But nevertheless, you've got our mins, maxes for the individual player Fargo, for the team Fargo.

For the team caps, does anybody have any questions?

Discussion: Timestamp 1:11:34

*The vote was taken as roll call to serve to take attendance as well as the vote

Timestamp: 1:34:45

Motion 2024-17 to approve proposal one of team caps

Approve: 49

Oppose: 2

Motion Approved

Abstain: 3

Scotch Proposal presented: Timestamp: 1:47:00

Jackson: So all the same stuff I just said and just went through, you know, we actually, you know, annihilated scotch from every single way we could think of. So I'm going to go ahead and pull that up here now. And this one's going to have three different proposals and you'll have to bear with me to explain one major difference in one of them. Okay, so from the top down, the top is the current as it is right now. Then we have three proposals going down from there. I'm going to focus on the last proposal first, so proposal three. Because that has the most significant change in it and would also be part of voting on gender free, another gender-free division. So looking at the bottom proposal first, again, the caps would be 1300, 1175, 1050, 925, and 800. And if you look up here at the original caps, as we use this last tournament. Its 1250, 1100, 1000, 900 and 800. Okay, so fairly, you know, fairly significant difference as you get up towards the top, right? From the lowest to the to the highest it increases in the separation. A lot of that is because the better you are, the wider range of players you can play or have more success against. But, you know, the other part of that is in order to make this specific cap work we really need the second division down to play as gender free. So just like the top division is currently gender free, we need to make the second division gender free.

The benefits of that are there would be a lot more, so our overall woman participation is down below the 500 level. And so that really fits better as in a scotch side of it as, you know, in those levels the third level down, fourth level down, fifth level down. So more opportunity to put teams together there and as you get to the second level down, there's a lot more male players in there and it's, you know, those male players would then not be pulling from, you know the female pool down there where there'd be a lot more opportunity. So hopefully for the Competition Committee, I explained that pretty well. But that is kind of the key to making that proposal work is the second division down needs to be gender free. So in looking in that, if you look at the spreads, there's a spread of 125 and that spread mimics the team spread of 250 with just two less players. So we looked at this and honestly, this was our first proposal, first and was going to be our only proposal. But with a little bit of forgetfulness, forgetfulness on my end, we overlooked the gender-free side of it and was looking at this from a completely gender-free standpoint. So that's the big explanation on proposal number three. Proposal number one and proposal number two were really an outcome of the forgetfulness on my end. So we then looked at another five division cap. And then we also took it and looked at it as a four division cap and maintaining a little bit wider spread. So, and it's a little bit wider spread all the way through so starting at 800, going to 950, 1100 and 1250. The reason for the wider spread thought, is when you look at Fargo, 75 points is a game, so 75 points per person is a game. And that really you know, creates a little bit larger gap with larger fields of players. If you look over here, it really changes in the center of our league. So as everybody knows if you look at it from a single standpoint, the silver and gold divisions are the largest divisions, which obviously means that we have

the most players at those skill levels so it very much mimics that here. We would have 21 teams in the platinum, 75 teams in the gold, 105 teams in the silver and 59 teams in the bronze and I'm using bronze, platinum, gold, and silver. We're looking at changing those names as well. Versus at the top up here. We've got 23 teams, 37 teams, 72 teams, 67 and 61 so, again, at the top there's minor changes in the middle there's more. Also, as we talked about before, it gives you the cap average, then it gives you the differential of player average. You know, which is essentially, average player Fargo of 606, where the cap divided by two is 625. So that's where this average number is derived from. 506, 550, 440, 475, 389, 400. So, as you can see, it really kind of narrows things down a little bit, brings people into their you know, kind of their better natural place.

Proposal number two, again, going back with five divisions, just like there is now. We've got 1250, 1125, 1000, 875 and 775. So this one again very much the same rule of thumb. With the 250 is the 125, so two less players cut it in half. This one is even closer, overall, we have an average Fargo of 611 with an average cap of 625. This is a per person. 526, 563, 469 and 500, 415 and 438, 363 and 368, or excuse me, 388. So, you know, keeping those player averages kind of in line, getting them a little bit tighter, that's the proposal number two.

Tami Conibear: Jackson, this is Tami. I think an easy way to break this down is basically, proposal one or proposal two is just adjusting our current caps. Proposal three is making the top two divisions genderless. And proposal one is breaking it down into four divisions with the top division being genderless are as a basic, simple breakdown.

Discussion: Timestamp: 1:56:48

After discussion, Jackson made a motion to approve proposal one or proposal two
Tammy Conibear seconded. Due to confusion on the zoom call this motion was not accepted or voted on.

Sam Rabito made a motion which was seconded.
Motion 2024-18 to table this item and send back to committee

No vote taken - President tabled this item until the next meeting.

Fun Day Committee: Nikki Bisconer Timestamp: 2:49:27

Fun day. Tracy helped us in the beginning. And then it was uh, Brittany DeWalt and Mike Deitchman that made that happen. And we came up with the games and figured out what we were doing and that all turned out really, really well, especially because I had never done that before. So there was a few things I wrote down on lessons that I need to work on to be better next time. But overall, it worked out really well. Next time we'll stop doing signups before I leave home. So that way they're all printed. But the idea that balloons are separated through the room so you know where to go, that'd be great. So in the girl's event, something I thought was kind of fascinating is um, where the girls chose to play. The 475, so you would think, first of all, Queen of the Hill was not fair matched. Queen of the Hill had 28. There was a 32 bracket, 28 people signed up for it. And then there was a girls fair match and only 10 girls signed up for that and five girls signed up for the 475 and under five girls signed up for the 55 and older group. So out of 48 players, 10 of them signed up for the men's and women divisional tournament, which I thought was fascinating because I figured more would be signing up for girls only or girls playing girls and that really wasn't, that really wasn't the case as much as I thought. So anyhow, that's my take on fun day, I'd like to get the fun day plan started sooner this year so that way we have time to work out the bugs and then moving, does anybody have any questions about fun day with me before I move on into the sponsorship stuff?

Sponsorship Committee: Nikki Bisconer Timestamp: 2:51:45

The Sponsorship Committee is Aaron Sullivan, Ed Slade, Amber, Sue. Okay, I want to say thanks to them because they, on the Sponsorship Committee, we kind of got thrown into this last minute and I hadn't done it before and everybody whipped together. We had sponsors that were dropping sponsorships as we were driving to the casino like it was so we're kind of fly by the seat of our pants. We're going to get way more ahead this time. We're already having sponsorship meetings once a week right now to figure out how to lay that out. We have so many views from Evo Sports and On The Wire, that it's helping us bring in a whole other idea of if when people or a business is sponsoring us, are they sponsoring just for people at the event, for all of us players to see the pictures on the walls and stuff of these bars or whatever sponsoring us. But now we have this new twist of all the people at home that are watching you play also that we're marketing to them also. And there's thousands of views and thousands of hours viewed. And so that's really helping us to be able to bring in more sponsors. So if you guys can think of any bars, any businesses that may want to be listed as a sponsor on Evo Sports and on On the Wire, as well as putting banners and stuff up, let me know and I would like to be able to get in touch with those people if you would like. I think that that's about all I got to say about those two committees. Thank you for letting me talk. Oh, and thank you guys for coming and playing and being part of this because that's the biggest thing, right? If you guys if we don't have the turnout, we don't have a tournament at all. The positive attitude of everybody at this event was, I think really fantastic we're making leaps and bounds of improvement as a whole.

*Ed Slade: Were we going to tell everybody about the Littman Light? We got a nine foot Littman Light, two by eight or two by nine for a nine foot table donated by Mike Littman.

And it was, like I said, it showed up like on Tuesday or Monday or something so we really didn't have a chance to get raffle tickets going or organize anything to get rid of it at the event.

So we have it in storage in Lincoln City. It's well protected and we're thinking that we might want to just sell it. It's worth \$1500 retail, but I think we would sell it for less than that to a Western BCA member. And, we just kind of like to sell it. So if anybody knows anyone that needs a brand new Littman Light for a nine foot table, touch base with Nikki or myself. We might be able to work something out.

Nikki: Yeah, I think that we came up with \$1200. Is that right? Whoever was taking notes, I think it was \$1200 and a free entry into the next tournament. The reason that we're not raffling it off is because since it's a nine foot light. There's not as many people that are interested in a nine foot light and so that's our reasoning for the madness of that.

Discussion: Timestamp: 2:56:00

Bylaws/Policy and Procedure Committee: Bill Henderson Timestamp: 2:59:05

Bill Henderson was not in attendance. Update given by Lawrence Frampton

Bill send out a bunch of stuff and it's in the email. That's really what I know on it. Unless, there's a couple of people in here that are part of that group as well. I don't have all the info on what was worked on and what was not, so I didn't see all of that. But I know that Shirley's in here. She might have worked on it, she's had some conversations with a couple people lately about it and Stephanie as well.

Tammy: We don't have to go through anything as far as a committee report or anything like that then on it. If they don't have anything major to add to that, we can move on to the unfinished business.

Camatha: Can I, yeah, I just have a comment for the policies and procedures. While I read the information. I think presentation for me to be able to vote is going to be so, so important as I'd like to see what it is now versus what you want to change it to. So I know there's a way to do a presentation whereas on the left is before and the right is the change. So I'd like to see before and after for a change. So that's just comments to that committee.

The President pushed this off to unfinished business in a future meeting when Bill Henderson will be available to present the item.

Unfinished Business:

1. **Remove the Board of Directors requirement to conduct annual performance evaluations of Association Officers from the Board of Directors job description in the bylaws.**

Author: Lawrence Frampton Timestamp: 3:01:29

*Items #1 & #2 were combined during presentation and discussion.

2. **Remove the requirement for the President to conduct annual performance evaluations of annually appointed staff for submission to the Board of Directors for review from the President's job description in Article V, Section 2, line 1, item 6 of the bylaws.**

Author: Lawrence Frampton

Again, as we discussed last time in Salem. I don't know when that's ever been done.

Somebody has maybe a long, long time ago, but we've never done that. And, we're a group of volunteers and I don't know that we should have to evaluate a group of volunteers. So we get voted in every two years. And if you don't like what we did, then don't vote us in, I think. I don't know that the board of directors should have to sit down with Tammy once, one time, it's going to be one time, right? If she doesn't get reelected but I don't think that we should have to sit down with her and say, hey, you did all these things great, but you did these things bad. I don't think that's fair to her. There's a lot on a lot of plates. There's nine people in the leadership group, sorry 10. I can't count very well because I don't ever count myself. There's 10 people in the leadership group. And we work pretty closely with each other every day, and I don't think it's fair for us to evaluate them. Annual staff's the next one on that same list. And that's another thing too we're that section of people, there's a small group of all of Western BCA. There's like 4,100 some members and I think there's maybe like 50 of them that are volunteering at an event. You know, it's pretty crazy. So I don't think it's fair for us to sit back and evaluate officers like that for the board of directors. And I don't think the president should have to evaluate their volunteer staff because if she doesn't like something that's going on. Then she can just ask him not to volunteer anymore.

*Tammy: And I agree. It's hard to, I mean, none of us get paid to do the job. So it's hard to say, oh, you sucked at doing whatever you know. So, I would rather give out the great job high five than I would saying somebody did a bad job.

*Suzanne Mackey: I make a motion that we remove the requirement of annual performance reviews of officers, directors, board members, and staff from our bylaws.

Discussion: Timestamp: 3:04:58

Motion 2024-19 to remove the requirement of performance reviews by the board of directors on officers and of the president on appointed staff as an annual requirement from the bylaws

Approved: 42

Opposed: 6

Abstained: 4

Motion Approved

3. **Approval of Board recommended changes to Policy & Procedures – Bill Henderson**

Timestamp: 3:43:12

This item was tabled until Bill Henderson is available to present. President will relay the expectation that the presentation includes the current wording and the changes requested.

New Business:

1. **Discussion – League Policy & Procedures – Lawrence Frampton** Timestamp: 3:44:27

The League Policies and Procedures Committee, which is separate from the Policies and Procedures Committee, those are two different things, it's myself, Johnny Landis, and Carly Watrous currently. And with that, we had come up with a bunch of league policies that kind of outlined some things. It was taken from the league operator's manual, went through some stuff, edited a bunch of things, created a new document, sent to the board of directors that got reviewed. Made a bunch of changes in there, that's what got sent all of you to review. It should have been sent out with the original and some reason it wasn't, but it got, but Julie sent it out the week later. So you guys have had it for like a week, hopefully to review and it needs to get approved or just sits there either way. I'm fine with whatever. We can talk about it.

Discussion: Timestamp: 3:45:22

Lawrence: I would like to table this until the next meeting please because it's 4.30. And I don't think that this is going to get solved anytime soon so, I will, however, I am going to send this document. Actually, some of you already have it, so I'm going to send it to a couple of the other league operators to get their input on it. We'll go that route with it.

2. **Discussion Topic – Qualifying for events clarification. Policy for qualifying?**

Tammy & Bill

This item was tabled by Tammy Culbertson

3. **Hall of Fame – Allowing those that have been inducted into the Western BCA Hall of Fame to be exempt from the 8 weeks to qualify.** Tammy Culbertson Timestamp: 4:32:50

It's not something that has to be voted on now. But anyway, so Hall of Fame. The Hall of Fame in those that have been inducted into the hall of fame have qualified for years, paid their dues for years, played league for years and so on or have spent their voluntary time working the event or whatnot. For whatever reason that they were inducted into the Hall of Fame. So my idea was to throw out there to allow those that have been inducted into the Western BCA Hall of Fame to be exempt from the eight weeks to qualify. Okay, they get a plaque and they get inducted into the Hall of Fame. They get a banner up on the, hanging from the ceiling, um and that's pretty much it. A lot of Hall of Fame inductees for other associations or organizations might get like a lifetime membership or um, I don't you know whatever but they, you know, at least they get something, a little something else than just the plaque or whatever or recognition. They would still have, my thought is that they would still pay their membership dues yearly, but they just would not have to play the eight weeks. I mean, obviously, if they're planning to go to Vegas or whatever, they still have to play the right weeks. That doesn't give

them that exception just for the regional events. Anyways, so that was my thought. If anybody has any feedback or their thoughts on it.

Discussion Timestamp 4:34:45

4. **Discussion – Room & Voucher transparency** – Author Michael Deitchman

Timestamp: 4:41:34

Tammy Culbertson: The next was the room and voucher transparency for Mike Deitchman. He presented an agenda item in regards to the food vouchers, the rooms and all that kind of stuff so I am going to give just a kind of a rundown, so his agenda item was proposed. So number one was number one well, number one and number two, he's asking how many suites were given to Western BCA as part of our contract with Chinooks and then how many rooms were given to Western BCA as part of our contract with Chinook Winds. Well, for nine ball we had, we ended up using 41 rooms total. So now that's rooms, that's not days on top, you know, as far as nights go. And I'm just going to give a rundown of how many people that actually get those rooms. So you've got setup and tear down, you've got approximately two rooms for setup for a couple days while they're setting up at the beginning and then two rooms for tear down for at the end of the event. Bad Boys gets three rooms. Referees get six or seven rooms, six usually for nine ball, seven usually for eight ball because it's busier. We usually have one more ref on staff. Live streamer gets one room. Payouts get six to seven rooms and the same because it's longer and it's busier with eight ball versus nine ball. And same with podium, six to seven. Tournament officials six to seven. We had six rooms this time. Usually it's around seven in eight ball. Booth, media, miscellaneous, all that kind of stuff was kind of stuff. Five rooms, five rooms and then hall of fame because nine ball is usually not as many volunteers and then we had actually a couple that would have had a room bow out or unable to make it at the last minute. So I was able, I did Hall of Fame had four rooms. Which um, a couple of them got, they got a couple for family and a couple were done for the nominees or the inductees, I should say, and then um and that was it. You know, I know Mike wants to go wants you to go through and okay. Let's see, what amount of the food vouchers were given so The breakdown on that is that we get, nine ball is \$3,500 or no, \$4,800 for food vouchers. And then we buy more, \$3,500 more.

*Julie: Can I interrupt real quick? Is Michael not here? We don't know what his question was?
Deitchman: I don't understand why I'm not being allowed to present the agenda item. I'm a bit confused

Michael Deitchman: So what I'm proposing is at the first meeting after each Chinook winds event, the treasurer, because the treasurer usually handles things like this. Will present a written report to the membership that includes the following information: How many suites were given to Western BCA as part of our contract? That's not rooms, that's the suites. That's extra big suites. Number two, how many rooms were given to Western BCA a part of our contract with Chinook Winds? Number three, what amount of food vouchers were given to Western BCA as a part of the contract with Chinook Winds and how much did each person receive? And number seven, a list of who received suites, rooms, food vouchers and their duties and the dates they provided those duties from. I think it's important to read it as I wrote it because,

you know, I heard some examples just a second ago that throw me off a lot. The Hall of Fame Committee was given rooms, but I didn't hear any other committee that was given rooms. There were Hall of Fame nominees that were given rooms or their families that were given rooms but all of them weren't given rooms. There was a lot of vagueness in what Tammy just said. No offense, Tammy. And actually, what Tammy just said is exactly why I think this needs to be a policy. And I guess I'm done.

Tammy: First of all, as far as the rooms go, and I think Sam, I don't know if Darin's on here still. Who else has been past president it has always been the president's decision on who gets the rooms.

Believe me, I'm not going to give it to favoritism or friends and it's going to be people that work the event. So as an example, I know that, like I said, there was the different rooms and not the Hall of Fame Committee got it. It was the Hall of Fame inductees and family. The family that was coming from out of town to be there for the ceremony got like a night. The food vouchers, food vouchers get distributed by the treasurer and a couple of the Payouts Committee and that is given \$24 per day per person, but you have to realize that that's, you know, a lot of us.

Deitchman: Okay. Okay. Well, let's take the food vouchers as an example. It's a great example. I received \$94 in food vouchers for my help with the Fun Day Committee and the Sponsorship Committee. Brittany DeWalt, who put in much more time than I put in, received nothing. I'm just trying to point out that we need to make this more official. It's thousands and thousands of dollars in rooms and vouchers that are distributed every six months. There is no accounting or transparency involved in it. This is a nonprofit volunteer-based organization. There's no reason something that is that important shouldn't be public information.

Discussion Timestamp: 4:59:02

After Discussion: Tammy stated that she would work with Bill Henderson on a guideline and/or policy for who receives rooms and food vouchers and the item was tabled to the next meeting

Meeting Adjourned: 5:18pm Next meeting date December 1, 2024